

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KEENEN R. AGEE,

Plaintiff

v.

RENO POLICE DEPARTMENT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:24-cv-00306-MMD-CSD

ORDER

Re: ECF Nos. 70, 73

Currently pending before the court are two motions to compel filed by the Plaintiff in this case. (ECF Nos. 70, 73.) The court previously denied Plaintiff's motion to compel for failure to comply with the court's Civil Standing Order which sets forth the process for informally attempting to resolve a discovery dispute before filing a formal motion to compel. (ECF Nos. 57, 60.) Here, Plaintiff *again* does not comply with the court's Civil Standing Order. (ECF No. 17.) The motion must be titled as a "Motion Regarding Discovery Dispute" and is limited to **5 pages**, and must contain certain provisions. Moreover, Plaintiff *again* fails to comply with Local Rule IA 1-3(f)(2), which provides that a declaration must state all meet and confer efforts, including the time, place, manner, and participants, and contain a certification that despite sincere efforts to resolve or narrow the dispute, the parties were unable to do so. The failure to comply with this rule is grounds for denial of the motions. LR IA 1-3(f)(4).

For these reasons, Plaintiff's motions (ECF Nos. 70, 73) are **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Plaintiff is reminded that although he is proceeding pro se, he still must comply with the Local Rules and the court's orders.

///

1 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

2 DATED: January 22, 2025.

3 
4 _____
5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23